STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA (Caption of Case) Petition of South Carolinians Against Monetary Abuse (SCAMA) and Leslie Minerd to Direct South Carolina Electric & Gas to Show Base Load Review Act (BLRA) Nuclear Debacle Charge on Monthly Electric Bill		PUBLIC SERVIO OF SOUTH	RE THE CE COMMISSION CAROLINA R SHEET	ACCEPTED FOR PROCESSING - 20
(Please type or print) Submitted by: Leslie Minered/	SCAMA	SC Bar Number:		2017 [
		Telephone: 803-79	9-9297	Decem b er
Address: 2716 Blossom Street		—	255 mg	- m.
Columbia, SC 29205		Other:		
Email: leslieminerd@gmail.com				
NOTE: The cover sheet and information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form is required for use by the Public Service Commission of South Carolina for the purpose of docketing and must be filled out completely.				
Emergency Relief demanded in petition Request for item to be placed on Commission's Agenda expeditiously Other: INDUSTRY (Check one) NATURE OF ACTION (Check all that apply)				
▼ Electric	Affidavit	X Letter	■ Request	346-
Electric/Gas	Agreement	Memorandum	Request for Certification	Ē.
☐ Electric/Telecommunications	Answer	Motion	Request for Investigation	Page
Electric/Water	Appellate Review	Objection	Resale Agreement	
Electric/Water/Telecom.	Application	Petition	Resale Amendment	1 of
Electric/Water/Sewer	Brief	Petition for Reconsideration	Reservation Letter	ယ်
Gas	Certificate	Petition for Rulemaking	Response	
Railroad	Comments	Petition for Rule to Show Caus		
Sewer	Complaint	Petition to Intervene	Return to Petition	
Telecommunications	Consent Order	Petition to Intervene Out of Tin	·	
Transportation	Discovery	Prefiled Testimony	Subpoena	
Water	Exhibit	Promotion	☐ Tariff	
Water/Sewer	Expedited Considerati	-	Other:	
Administrative Matter	Interconnection Agree	-		
Other:	Interconnection Amen			
	Late-Filed Exhibit	Report		
	Print Form	Reset Form		

December 15, 2017

Ms. Jocelyn Boyd South Carolina Public Service Commission 101 Executive Center Dr., Suite 100 Columbia, SC 29210-8411

Re: Scheduling Issues Concerning Docket 2017-346-E, "Petition of South Carolinians Against Monetary Abuse (SCAMA) and Leslie Minerd to Direct South Carolina Electric & Gas to Show Base Load Review Act (BLRA) Nuclear Debacle Charge on Monthly Electric Bill"

Dear Ms. Boyd,

I am writing concerning what appear to be some scheduling conflicts in Docket 2017-346-E, as communicated by the Clerk's Office.

In a communication from the Clerk's Office entitled "30 Day Notice and Complaint," dated November 30, 2017, South Carolina Efectric & Gas (SCE&G) has been given 30 days to respond to my compliant. Given upcoming holidays, this means that the response is due in early January 2018. But, at this point, it is unknown if SCE&G will respond or contest the filing.

With the public interest and credibility of the company in mind, the best course of action would be for SCE&G to simply agree to the request to place the Baseload Review Act "Nuclear Construction Cost" on the monthly bill. Thus, in the event that SCE&G agrees to place the charge in the bill the issue may be rendered moot. Likewise, if there is no response to the request by SCE&G, I/SCAMA will apply to the Commission for the relief sought in my request.

in a PSC "Prefile Testimony Letter" of December 8, 2017, it is stated:

The Complainant/Petitioner must prefile with the Commission 1 copy of the direct testimony and exhibits of the witnesses it intends to present and serve the testimony and exhibits of the witnesses on all Parties of Record on or before January 3, 2018 (must be post-marked on or before this date).

The January 3 date means that my testimony filing is due at approximately at the same time by which SCE&G has to respond to my initial request. This would mean that I might not even know at the time my testimony has to be filed if SCE&G has chosen to respond or not. If the company does respond at the end of the 30-day period, I would have little or no opportunity to see or

review any SCE&G response and will not know the course of action the company pursues regarding this matter.

I thus request that the testimony filing date be changed so as to give me at least two weeks after SCE&G's deadline for a response my request. I thus suggest that the date for initial testimony filing be set on January 15, 2018 or later. The other dates for filings would therefore be adjusted.

I apologize if I have misunderstand the schedule of filings and/or the PSC procedures being applied in this matter.

In any event, I hold open the possibility of an offer of a settlement agreement to the parties at any time in this matter, so as to possibly avoid the time and expense involved in an already crowded PSC schedule on the VC Summer nuclear debacle issue. I will seek to avoid a hearing on this matter and, keeping the public interest in mind, am hopeful that SCE&G will agree to the request and decide to be transparent about the BLRA charge. Obviously, it is in the hands of SCE&G to show its good will and choose the time-efficient and cost-efficient path which avoids a hearing or to choose an alternative path. I thus believe that dealing with this matter in an expedited matter will be in the interest of the PSC, SCE&G and its customers and the state of South Carolina.

I hereby certify that I have mailed this letter to Ms. Shannon Hudson at the Office of Regulatory Staff (ORS) and, even though SCE&G is not yet a party to the docket, to Mr. Chad Burgess at SCE&G.

Sincerely,

Leslie Minerd

2716 Blossom Street

Columbia, SC 29205 🗀

for myself and South Carolinians Against Monetary Abuse (SCAMA)